



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,433	10/14/2003	W. Todd Daniel	190250-1580	7279
38823	7590	06/30/2008		
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/ AT&T Delaware Intellectual Property, Inc. 600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E. SUITE 1500 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994			EXAMINER	
			LAI, MICHAEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/686,433	DANIELL, W. TODD	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MICHAEL C. LAI	2157	

-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

THE REPLY FILED **19 May 2008** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,10,11,18-20 and 25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
 See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Yves Dalencourt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument, see page 5-6, Section I, with respect to "in response to determining that the sender of the received email is currently present at an IM account, automatically launching an IM session with the sender", is not persuasive. The reference to Appelman is directed to an "Instant Messaging Network" that has the capability to monitor whether a certain user is capable of receiving an instant message at a particular moment (see abstract). Appelman further discloses "automatically configuring IM communication between an intended recipient of an email message and the sender of the email message" (see abstract). The reference goes on to state [in column 13, line 60 to column 14, line 31] in various ways how the IM system verifies the online or offline status of email receivers or senders in order to determine whether or not to launch Instant Messaging communications between each other. In view of the foregoing, it is evident that the reference to Appelman clearly provides for the claimed limitation of "in response to determining that the sender of the received email is currently present at an IM account, automatically launching an IM session with the sender". Applicant's argument, see page 7-8, Section II, with respect to "computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to, in response to determining that the sender of the received email is currently present at an IM account, automatically launching an IM session with the sender", is not persuasive for the same reason above. Besides, the phrase "adapted to" is language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (see MPEP 2106). As a result, the limitation after "adapted to" carries no weight for the claim limitation. The same reason also applies to Applicant's arguments on sections III, IV, V, VI.